



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,181	11/13/2003	Jiebo Luo	87279DMW	7890
7590 Pamela R. Crocker Patent Legal Staff Eastman Kodak Company 343 State Street Rochester, NY 14650-2201			EXAMINER KRASNIC, BERNARD	
			ART UNIT 2624	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/09/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/712,181

Applicant(s)

LUO ET AL.

Examiner

BERNARD KRASNIC

Art Unit

2624

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Bernard Krasnic (Examiner).

(3) Mr. Marc Rossi (Reg. No. 31,923).

(2) Samir Ahmed (SPE).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 9/5/2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal (copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Simpson ("A recurrent neural network classifier for improved retrievals of areal extent of snow cover", IEEE 2001) and Loui ("Automatic Image Event Segmentation and Quality Screening for Albuming Applications", IEEE 2000).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicant's representative, Mr. Rossi, wanted to discuss the art rejection on claim 1 and how the prior art references don't read on the claim limitations. The Examiners disagreed and believed that the combination Simpson in view of Loui does indeed teach the claimed limitations and stated that the rejection will be maintained in the future Final Office Action.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Bernard Krasnic/
Examiner, Art Unit 2624

/Samir A. Ahmed/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624